

Proposals 016–020 to amend the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature

[Published concurrently in TAXON]

DAVID L. HAWKSWORTH^{*1}, PEDRO W. CROUS², JOSÉ C. DIANESE³,
MARIEKA GRYZENHOUT⁴, LORELEI L. NORVELL⁵ & KEITH A. SEIFERT⁶

¹ *d.hawksworth@nhm.ac.uk*

*Honorary President, International Mycological Association
Facultad de Farmacia, Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Plaza Ramón y Cajal, Madrid 28040, Spain
Department of Botany, Natural History Museum
Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

² *President, International Mycological Association
CBS Fungal Diversity Centre, PO Box 85167, 3508 AD Utrecht, The Netherlands*

³ *Past-President, Associação Latino-Americana de Micologia
Departamento de Fitopatologia, Universidade de Brasília
70910-900 Brasília DF, Brasil*

⁴ *President, African Mycological Association
Forestry & Agricultural Biotechnology Institute, University of Pretoria
Pretoria, 0002 South Africa*

⁵ *MYCOTAXON Editor-in-Chief & Secretary, Nomenclature Committee for Fungi
Pacific Northwest Mycology Service
6720 NW Skyline Blvd., Portland, OR 97229-1309, USA*

⁶ *Chair, International Commission on the Taxonomy of Fungi
Biodiversity (Mycology and Botany), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
960 Carling Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada*

**Proposals (016–020) to amend the Code to make clear that it covers the
nomenclature of fungi and to modify its governance with respect to names of
organisms treated as fungi**

A previous series of proposals to change the name of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature [hereafter referred to as simply the CODE] and make cognate adjustments (Hawksworth 1993, TAXON 42: 156–162) was ruled as rejected at the Tokyo Congress in 1993, the main proposal having received only 24 votes for and 158 against in the mail ballot. The issue has not been considered

* Author for correspondence

since, either at the St Louis Congress in 1999 or at the Vienna Congress in 2005. The evidence that *Fungi* are part of the same “superkingdom” as *Animalia*, which has been termed *Opisthokonta* (Adl & al. 2005, J. EUKARYOT. MICROBIOL. 52: 399–451), is now overwhelming (e.g. James & al. 2006, NATURE 443: 818–822.). In addition, since the series of International Mycological Congresses was initiated in 1971, the number of mycologists attending Nomenclature Section meetings at International Botanical Congresses has been minimal, rarely reaching double figures; very few mycologists are personal members of IAPT and thus able to vote in the mail ballot. In contrast, nomenclatural debates at recent International Mycological Congresses have attracted 200–300 participants.

Mycologists as a community wish to be seen as independent from botanists, as reflected in an informal vote at the International Mycological Congress in Cairns in 2006: although most participants did not complete voting slips, of those completed 36 votes were for either a separate mycological code or changing the name of the botanical code, and only 4 voted for no change (Rossman 2006, MYCOL. RES. 110: 1254). In Cairns there were also forceful presentations from several leading mycologists on the need for the international mycological community, rather than the botanical community, to govern mycological nomenclature. In April 2007, a majority of the 39 mycologists participating in an international workshop on “*Aspergillus* systematics in the genomic era” in Utrecht “saw the need for a separate fungal nomenclatural code such as the code which the bacteriologists use” (Samson & al. 2007, STUD. MYCOL. 59: 71–73). During August–September 2007, mycologists attending nomenclatural sessions or symposia at the Mycological Society of America annual meeting (Baton Rouge, Louisiana), the XV Congress of European Mycologists (St Petersburg, Russia), and the XVI Simposio Botánica Criptogámica de España (Léon, Spain) were asked to complete ballots on various issues related to the naming of fungi. A total of 95 questionnaires were completed from this geographically dispersed spectrum of mycologists. All did not vote on all issues, but of those voting, 73.3% (63) votes favoured a unified code covering all groups of organisms, but in the absence of a unified code 82.7% (62) wished to see decisions on fungal nomenclature voted at International Mycological Congresses rather than at International Botanical Congresses (Hawksworth 2007, MYCOL. RES. 111: 1363–1364).

We trust that the proposals below will enable the international mycological community to assume full responsibility for the nomenclature of fungi. If accepted, the proposals made here could prevent an unfortunate and untimely schism. The proposals are divided into two groups, the first relating to the name of the CODE and to clarification of its coverage, and the second to the decision-making on mycological matters under the CODE.

In any event, a Nomenclatural Session will be convened during the IX International Mycological Congress in Edinburgh in 2010 that will debate the issue of a separate mycological code as well as consider and vote on proposals to change provisions in the current CODE for fungal organisms. The Editor-in-Chief and Managing Editor of MYCOTAXON have also agreed in principle to publish formal nomenclatural proposals relating to fungi that will also appear in TAXON. [Although it has become normal practice for such proposals to be published in TAXON, there is no requirement stated explicitly in the CODE.] Decisions made at the Nomenclature Session in Edinburgh in 2010 are to be transmitted to the Nomenclature Section meetings in Melbourne in 2011. If the proposals made here are accepted in Melbourne, any decisions relating only to fungal organisms made in Edinburgh would be available for adoption there.

Proposals on the name and coverage of the Code

(016) Establish more clearly that the CODE covers mycology, the study of fungi, as well as botany, commonly defined as “the study of plants” by:

- (i) inserting “and Mycological” after “Botanical” in the title of the CODE.
- (ii) replacing “requires” by “and mycology require” at the start of Pre. 1.
- (iii) replacing the “word ‘plant’” by the “words ‘plant’ and ‘fungus’”, and inserting “and mycologists respectively” after “botanists” in the footnote to Pre. 1.
- (iv) inserting in Div. III.1 footnote 1, “and mycological” after “botanical”.

(017) Instruct the Editorial Committee to replace “plant(s)” by “plant(s) or fungus/fungi” throughout the CODE where this is intended to include all organisms covered by the CODE.

Proposals on decision making for fungi in the Code

(018) Amend Div. III.2 to provide for the election of the Permanent Nomenclature Committee for Fungi by an International Mycological Congress:

In Div. III.2, insert in line 2 after “Taxonomy”: “or in the case of the Committee for Fungi the International Mycological Association”.

In Div. III.2, insert after “Congress”: “except in the case of the Committee for Fungi which is elected at each International Mycological Congress”.

(019) Amend Div. III.4 to permit decision-making on proposals relating solely to organisms treated as fungi to be taken at an International Mycological Congress:

In the first sentence, replace “two” by “three”, replace “and” before “ (b)” by “;”, and insert after “Congress” “, or (c) for proposals relating solely to organisms treated as fungi, a vote taken at the Nomenclatural Session of an International Mycological Congress”

Insert in the second paragraph after “voting”: “on proposals not relating solely to organisms treated as fungi”.

After Div. III.4 (b), insert a new final paragraph relating to “Qualifications for voting”: “(c) Voting at the Nomenclature Session of an International Mycological Congress (on proposals relating solely to organisms treated as fungi):

All officially registered full members of the Congress present at the Nomenclature Session have a personal vote. No accumulation or transfer of personal votes is permissible, and no institutional votes are granted.

(020) Insert a new Div. III.5 and footnote:

“The decisions taken at a Fungal Nomenclature Session relating solely to organisms treated as fungi are binding on the Nomenclature Section convened at the subsequent International Botanical Congress^{**}. Such decisions will, however, be open for any editorial adjustments deemed necessary by the Editorial Committee. That Committee must include either the Secretary of the Committee for Fungi, or an alternate nominated by that Committee, as one of its members)”.

^{**} “The Rapporteur-général appointed for that Congress, or an alternate appointed by the Rapporteur-général, is expected to attend the Nomenclature Session as a non-voting Advisor to the Session.”

NOTE — We wish to emphasise that, while most of us making these proposals have, or have recently, held positions in international mycological organizations or committees, we make them here in our personal capacities in anticipation of their consideration by mycologists as a whole at the 9th International Mycological Congress in 2010. Officers in two other key international mycological organizations decided not be co-proposers as they personally felt that an independent code governing the nomenclature of fungi is to be preferred.

Acknowledgement

We wish to record our thanks to John McNeill for his wise counsel and advice in formulating these proposals.